# LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT


NOTES OF THE MONTH
R.P.D.

WORLD TRADE UNION CONFERENCE
B. Frachon Ernest Thornton
S. A. Dange Will Lawther

REPARATIONS
Maurice Dobb

CRIMEA AND THE LIBERATION OF EUROPE
Quæstor

THE BULGARIAN TRIALS
Michael Padev

HOUSING IN SHEFFIELD
Councillor Howard Hill

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE
Ground Staff

DOCUMENT OF THE MONTH

BOOK REVIEWS


## CRIMEA COVENANT

6D


MARCH 1945

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXVII. No. 3

# CONTENTS

March, 1945


*Page*

Notes of the Month—*Crimea Covenant* by R. P. D. .... .... .... 65

*The World Trade Union Conference—*

(i) B. FRACHON, General Secretary of the C.G.T. .... .... 73

(ii) ERNEST THORNTON, Chairman of Australian Delegation .... 74

(iii) S. A. DANGE, Chairman, All-India Trades Union Congress 75

(iv) WILL LAWTHER, President, National Union of Mineworkers 76

Reparations by MAURICE DOBB .... .... .... .... .... .... .... 78

Crimea and the Liberation of Europe by QUAESTOR .... .... .... 82

The Bulgarian Trials by MICHAEL PADEV.... .... .... .... .... 85

Housing in Sheffield by COUNCILLOR HOWARD HILL .... .... .... 87

The Soldiers' Vote by GROUND STAFF .... .... .... .... .... 90

*Document of the Month*—The Crimea Conference .... .... .... 92

*Book Reviews—*

Shot and Shell—without Strategy by R.P.D. .... .... .... 96

Shorter Notice .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... 96


## One Pound for each year of LABOUR MONTHLY'S existence

"I have long felt an obligation to repay a debt of long standing. In this 25th year of L.M.'s existence I will try to collect £25 for your Guarantee Fund. Therefore I am sending you a first instalment of £2 2s. 0d. from myself and two other friends and would be glad if you would acknowledge it in the paper as from '1st £25 Group.'

"I hope this may inspire other groups to do likewise, and that by this means you may, in 1945, fully achieve your aim of over £100 per month."

January, £108 13s. 9d., February, £94 17s. 6d. Shall we reach £100 in March? A reader puts forward an excellent suggestion which, if taken up by other groups of readers, should ensure that we reach and maintain our target. In the words of another reader, "With the greater circulation which more paper and more money would allow, what an influence L.M. would have! WE READERS CANNOT SUPPLY THE PAPER, BUT WE CAN SUPPLY THE MONEY."

*Continued on page iii. of cover*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# NOTES OF THE MONTH

## Crimea Covenant

EVERY confident expectation of the Crimea Conference has been surpassed by the outcome. When the Crimea Declaration speaks of "the greatest opportunity in history," that phrase does not exaggerate the significance of the decisions reached. Never before has any international agreement been so far-reaching in scope, so explicit and constructive in content, or backed with such overwhelming power for fulfilment. The Crimea Conference has not only reached practical immediate decisions for action, for shortening the war and speeding victory, and for the first steps of settlement in relation to Germany and the liberation of Europe. It has also set out a long-term programme for world development, for peace and for the advance of democracy, which will govern the future for many years. The promise of Teheran is being fulfilled.

## Planning the Future

It has been said that with the advent of Marxism unconscious history begins to become conscious history, in the sense that the science of social development appears for the first time upon the scene and is able to play a practical part in shaping events; just as with the final future advance to world communist society mankind becomes at last the master of its destiny and no longer the helpless object of blind uncomprehended forces. On a world scale that stage has not yet been reached. But with the co-operative agreements of the three decisive World Powers, including one Socialist Power, at Teheran and Yalta, no longer in terms of vague emotional aspirations, but of concrete objectives, corresponding to urgent present needs, overriding social and political differences, and with full power of fulfilment behind them, we can already begin to see the first rough foreshadowing of the future of planned world development, which in the years to come will draw more and more closely within our grasp.

## Fight for the Decisions

Obstacles in abundance remain to be overcome; but the path forward for mankind, not only in broad ultimate objectives, but in immediate next steps, has never stood out so clear. The Crimea decisions are not only a diplomatic treaty; they are firm guiding lines for the next stage of human history. All policies and prospects need to be carefully reviewed in the light of these decisions, which set out a plain path of advance for all democratic nations and for all democratic parties and organisations. The World Trade Union Conference has justly emphasised the importance of actively fighting for the prompt and effective fulfilment of the Crimea decisions. The almost universal and surprised press welcome, which succeeded to the previous riot of speculations on supposed dilemmas and discords, must not blind us to the still continuing manifold opposition which needs to be defeated, if "the greatest opportunity in history" is to be fulfilled.

## Speeding Victory

First and foremost stand out the military decisions; for these represent the gateway to all the other aims. The "full agreement" on "the timing, scope and co-ordination of new and even more powerful blows to be launched by our armies and air forces into the heart of Germany from east, west, north and south" is not less important than the previous Teheran "complete agreement as to the scope and timing of the operations which will be undertaken from the east, west and south," which preceded the Second Front. Although the Crimea communique, thanks to the fulfilment of the Teheran decisions, the opening

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Second Front and the present Soviet offensive, can declare that "Nazi Germany is doomed" and that "resistance" is "hopeless," the final battles have still to be fought to complete that doom. The United States Director of the Office of War Mobilisation, James Byrnes, returning from the Conference, has spoken of the gathering of men and material for operations in March on a scale exceeding any previously undertaken. All efforts need to be concentrated on support for this impending offensive. With every day that passes, in view of the prostration of Europe and the terrible destruction which is taking place, it becomes of more and more vital importance to hasten the ending of the war in Europe.

**1918 and 1945**

On the prospect of this offensive, attention may be called to the contrast drawn by Colonel Tolchenov, in the current number of *The War and the Working Class* (whose appearance in an English edition will be warmly welcomed), between the situation at the time of Ludendorff's last offensive in March, 1918, whose defeat was followed by the final victorious allied offensive, and Rundstedt's attempted counter-offensive in December, 1944. At the time of Ludendorff's offensive in March, 1918, the Germans had 193 divisions, or 80 per cent. of their effectives, in the west, and 90 per cent. of their artillery, and only 50 divisions (with 30 Austro-Hungarian divisions) against the Soviet detachments in the Baltic, Byelorussia and the Ukraine; while the western allies had 180 divisions and a slight inferiority in artillery. At the time of Rundstedt's offensive in December, 1944, the Germans had 75 to 80 divisions in the west, and 200 divisions in the east; "during October and November, 1944, alone, the Germans transferred from other fronts to the Soviet-German front 32 divisions"; while "the Anglo-American armies have two or three times more men, unquestioned superiority in artillery and tanks, and overwhelming superiority in aircraft." Ludendorff was able to concentrate 62 divisions on his offensive; Rundstedt only 15 divisions. The defeat of Ludendorff's offensive prepared the way for the final victorious allied offensive from the west. Following the defeat of Rundstedt's offensive, the conditions are now gathered for the final combined allied offensive from the west, north, south and east, whose fulfilment will determine the end of the war in Europe.

**"Terms of Unconditional Surrender"**

The Crimea announcement that agreement has been reached on "the unconditional surrender terms" which will be imposed on Nazi Germany after military defeat should end once and for all the barren controversy which has endeavoured to treat the slogan of "unconditional surrender" as equivalent to the negation of any "terms," or alternatively as excluding any political approach to the German people to turn against Nazism and militarism and end "a hopeless resistance." "Unconditional surrender" does not mean that there are no "terms" of armistice, but that those terms are imposed by complete victory, and cannot be the subject of negotiation or parley with any representatives of German power. There can be no loophole left for German Nazism or militarism to avert its doom by diplomatic manoeuvres, or to conceal its absolute military defeat under cover of negotiations which can be subsequently used to create the myth of the "undefeated German armies." There can be no room for the method of the Wilsonian Fourteen Points, which were in fact originally invented, in response to an urgent call from the American propaganda representative, Creel, in Petrograd as a counter to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appeal of the Bolshevik Revolution, and which were subsequently used by the Nazis to cover up the German military defeat in 1918.

**One Million Free Germans**

But this does not exclude the direct plain appeal, not primarily from allied sources, but from Germans to the German people, to break with Nazism and recognise that "the German people will only make the cost of their defeat heavier to themselves by attempting to continue a hopeless resistance" and that only the extirpation of German Nazism and militarism can hold out the "hope for a decent life for Germans and a place for them in the comity of nations." The success of this appeal is shown by the work of the Free German movement, which is now said to have one million organised members in the German prisoner-of-war camps in the Soviet Union—a considerable initial force for assisting in the task of cleansing Germany after the war. The opposite method still prevails in the German prisoner-of-war camps in Britain and the United States, where Nazi discipline is maintained, Nazi propaganda disseminated, anti-Nazi literature officially prohibited by the allied authorities, and anti-Nazis are maltreated, terrorised and even murdered—thus maintaining a hotbed of Nazism under allied protection on allied soil, such as can only serve to let loose an army of indoctrinated Nazi fighters into Germany after the war. This scandalous situation needs to be speedily changed; and it would be well if some of the Anglo-American planners who are busy with their academic schemes for the "re-education" of Germany after the war, would turn their attention to the practical present task of the re-education of the Germans now in the prisoner-of-war camps in co-operation with the Free German movement in this country and the United States.

**Nazism, Militarism and the German People**

The Crimea Declaration has set out in plain and explicit terms the measures which will be undertaken "to destroy German militarism and Nazism" (not only Hitlerism) "and to ensure that Germany will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world." These include the disbandment of "all German armed forces" (no longer the loophole of the professional long-service army permitted by Versailles in the name of the fight against Bolshevism, which provided the basis for militarist revival); dissolution of the General Staff (the direct inspirer and planner of Nazism); destruction or removal of all military equipment, and elimination or removal of all industrial war potential. "All war criminals" (therefore including Hitler, Himmler, Hess and the rest) are to be brought to "just and swift punishment" (not pleasant exile). "Reparations in kind" will be exacted for all damage done. All Nazi institutions are to be dissolved; and "all Nazi and militarist influences" are to be removed from "public offices" (Allied commanders in the Rhineland, please note) and from "cultural and economic life." Altogether, a magnificent programme, equally in the interests of the German people and of all the peoples in the world. Let us make sure that it is fulfilled to the last letter.

**Verdict of the Civilised World**

Undoubtedly the German people will have to pay the price for fascism. The payment of that price is the main part of re-education (which will never be accomplished by Sunday-school lectures of complacent ignoramuses from British and American universities chattering about social and political matters of which they have no understanding). The stern decisions of the Crimea Conference represent the conscience of the civilised world. They have the whole-hearted support of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every democratic nation. They have the support, with even stronger emphasis on the necessary measures to be taken, of the World Trade Union Conference, representing sixty million organised workers. The fragmentary voices of opposition from the unholy alliance of Vatican reaction, pacifists, Tribunites and misguided individuals, represent no popular support and shall not be allowed to clog the wheels of justice.

**Nemesis of Fascism**

We honour the tiny handful of heroic German anti-fascist fighters, the German Communists and true democrats, who have faced untold horrors, and few of whom survive. They represent the only honourable tradition of the past and the hope of the future for the German nation. They are the first to recognise and welcome the justice of the Crimea decisions, and to be ready to share in the hard travail of rehabilitation of their nation from the plague and corruption which has descended upon it. For the indoctrinated Nazi beasts and criminals there can be no pity. For the mass of the German people, whose typical guilt was slavish "non-political" submission to authority, to share in the loot and become accomplices in crime, evidence from the now occupied regions shows how far demoralisation has gone after twelve years of Nazism (German commanders having to issue orders to their men not to plunder and rape inside Germany, as was customary and permissible in conquered territory; the Red Army having to intervene to prevent German women looting German homes). Here softness and immunity will not avail, but only provide fresh breeding ground for Nazism, and feed the abject belief that the invincible Nazi gangsters and militarists will always "get away with it," as after 1918, and come out on top again. Here the hard path of retribution must teach the lesson.

**A Lesson for All Time**

It is not only intolerable that the nations which have been the victims of German Nazism should have to pay all the costs of the havoc wrought against them. It is also essential that the German nation shall have to pay the price for fascism, and that that price shall be engraven on the memory of the German people and of every people in the world. From the fate of Germany every people in the world can learn that the nation which surrenders to fascism touches poison; can know with horror, if ever a Mosley or similar ruffian dares to show his face in public, that that path is the path to the abyss, and that the only outcome will be, not the bands and banners, the intoxication of conquest and loot, but the ashes of ruin and stern merciless long-lasting retribution. Only on that basis can there be hope for the future for the German people, for "a decent life for Germans and a place for them in the comity of nations."

**Democracy and Fascism**

If the Crimea decisions have to set necessary destructive tasks, these are only the complement of the greater aims of construction. In no respect is the enormous advance of the world democratic movement achieved by the time of the Crimea Conference more clearly expressed than in the decisions of the Conference on democracy and fascism. The Teheran Agreement set the objectives for the military defeat of Nazi Germany and for the establishment of world security, together with the general aim of "the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance." The Crimea Declaration has set out in concrete terms the objectives for the moral and political liquidation of fascism in liberated Europe and for the victory of democracy. For the first time, in the Declaration on Europe, the task of the liquidation of fascism is officially recognised as an

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aim of the United Nations extending beyond Germany and Italy.

**Fascism Shall Not Escape**

Hitherto, in American official expression, as of President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull, and in Soviet official expression, of the Soviet leaders and press, there has been full recognition of the necessity of the destruction of fascism in all countries as the enemy of democracy and world peace. It was the former Secretary of State, Hull, who broadcast in April, 1944, the downright statement that "Free Governments and Nazi and Fascist Governments cannot exist together in this world. . . . There can be no compromise with Nazism and fascism. It must go everywhere." But British official expression has hitherto shown a certain tongue-tied shyness and hesitancy on this point: it recognised Germany and the German Nazi system as an enemy, just as it had recognised Italy and the Italian fascist system as an enemy; but it was unwilling to recognise fascism in general, in countries other than Italy and Germany, as an enemy, operating on the basis of the fifth column against the United Nations, democracy and peace. So much was this the case that a typical Munichite like Beverley Baxter could in 1945 argue in a debate in Cambridge that fascism was "a bogy *invented by the left*" (let him ask the mutilated millions of Europe, whether at the hands of a Franco, a Salazar, a Metaxas, a Petain, a Horthy, a Hitler or a Mussolini, not to mention the victims savaged by blackshirt hooligans in London before Joyce passed over to take direct service with his master). That issue has been settled by the Crimea Declaration:—

> The establishment of order in Europe and the rebuilding of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice.

The significance of this declaration for the situation of Franco-Spain, Salazar-Portugal and Peron-Argentine, will inevitably have to come up for consideration, and has already been sharply raised at the World Trade Union Conference.

**Democracy—the Acid Test**

*Not less important than this official* recognition of the task "to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and fascism" in liberated Europe is the new and deeper understanding of democracy which is the counterpart of this basic anti-fascist approach. The aim of democracy and democratic development is the recurring keynote of the Crimea Declaration. The three Powers will concert their action to "meet the economic and political problems of liberated Europe in accordance with democratic principles." They will seek to assist the liberated peoples "to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems." The immediate objective is "to form interim Governmental authorities representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of Governments responsive to the will of the people." The enlarged Polish Provisional Government of National Unity will hold "free and unfettered elections on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot" in which "all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates." These declarations are not only important in helping to solve, on an agreed basis, without destructive inner conflict, the urgent problems of liberated Europe. They are not only important in providing common ground for the joint action of the three Powers, despite those differences of their social and political systems on which the disrupters banked to provide insoluble conflict, to promote in common a democratic

PRODUCED 2008 BY MARLBORO
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

path of solution. They are equally important in that they express for the first time in an official document an enormous advance in the understanding of democracy, an understanding which has made possible this common ground—the understanding, vital for the whole future, that democracy includes the equal rights and participation of all democratic parties, including Communism, and excludes fascism and supporters of fascism.

**Advance of an Epoch**

In the inter-war decades the aim of democracy was distorted and stultified by anti-communism, which proved the breeding-ground for fascism. In place of the living unity of the working-class and all supporters of democracy against fascism and reaction, the vicious formula was presented of democracy as an abstraction "against communism and fascism." The result was to divide the forces of democracy, to cut off the militant working-class, the most consistent and vigorous fighters for democracy, from the common democratic front, and thus to play straight into the hands of fascism. In practice the devotees of the formula "against communism and fascism" directed their fire against communism, either made it illegal, as in many European countries, or imposed special anti-democratic bans and discriminations against it to prevent the exercise of its rights within the labour movement, while practising tolerance for fascism in the name of "freedom of expression" and "democratic rights," and even appeasement to fascism. This was what made possible the victories of fascism over democracy. Anti-communism, the central slogan of fascism, was smuggled into the democratic camp by a blind and bigoted section. Anti-communism was the Achilles' heel of the democratic front, on which fascism continuously played to win its victories. In the international arena, the fatal division of the western democratic powers from the Soviet Union. In the national sphere, the division of the democratic front by refusal of unity with communism. Only the hard experience of the common struggle against fascism has taught the lesson of unity, and that lesson has now been learned over the Continent of Europe. The Crimea Declaration has confirmed that lesson and proclaimed the new and deeper understanding of democracy as a basic principle of the United Nations.

**Democratic Unity**

Already the Teheran Agreement bridged the gulf of oceans of old prejudices and misunderstandings when it proclaimed the common democratic principles, despite differences of constitutional forms, of the British, American and Soviet peoples—"dedicated as are our own peoples to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance." The Crimea Declaration has carried this further when it established the basis of democratic advance for the European countries. The "interim Governmental authorities representative of all democratic elements in the population" are exemplified in the nine European Governments now established with communist representation. The "free and unfettered elections" to be held in Poland are to be open to "all democratic and anti-Nazi parties"—that is, including communism and excluding fascism. The same principle has been established in the World Trade Union Conference, and in the mighty World Trade Union International now to be formed, with full and equal rights for communist participation, and discrimination only against fascism. Democracy is defined by the Crimea Declaration for all the countries of liberated Europe as including the full and equal rights of communism as an integral part of the broad democratic front, and as outlawing fascism and all parties sup-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

porting fascism. This deeper understanding of democracy, now given official recognition by the United Nations, contains the sure hope for the future, that the future will not repeat the crimes and follies and disasters of the past, and that the living democracy of the people will find its way forward to the achievement of the people's aims.

**A Hint for the Labour Party**

It is evident that the leadership of the Labour Party will have to draw some rapid practical conclusions from the Crimea Declaration, if they are not to fall out of step with the official policy of the United Nations, as well as with the policy of all the other socialist parties of Europe, and also of the world labour movement, as expressed in the World Trade Union International, and if they are not to become the residuary legatees of anti-communism in Europe after the demise of Hitler. On January 18 Mr. Attlee in the House of Commons thought fit to declare that "he did not believe that the people who held the opinions of Mr. Gallacher were democratic; they were reactionary because they supported the doctrine of force." It looks as if Mr. Churchill, on his return from the Crimea, will have to enlighten Mr. Attlee, and explain to him that this kind of sentiment is not compatible with the basis and policy of the United Nations, and that the policy of the United Nations, as set out in the Crimea Declaration, recognises communism as an integral part of the democratic camp. In the Europe of today, which has gone through the fires of the struggle against fascism, there is no room for the bigoted sectional reactionary outlook which would seek to exclude a Marshal Tito or a Thorez or a Togliatti, any more than a Pollitt or a Gallacher or a Horner, from the fighting democratic camp.

**Democracy in the Labour Movement**

It is not compatible with the democratic conception of the Crimea Declaration to seek to maintain anti-democratic bans or discrimination against communism within the labour movement. What is in question here is not to claim any special privileges or position for communism within the labour movement, but only the same democratic rights as any other section of democratic opinion within the organised movement. Mr. Attlee is at liberty to oppose the principles of communism and seek by democratic procedure to convince the majority of the movement of the correctness of his viewpoint. What is not defensible is to deny the dues-paying members of the Labour Party equal rights to express democratically their opinions, vote on issues or elect the delegates of their choice, for fear that democratic procedure would result in a majority contrary to the desires of those responsible for the bans. It is time to end the anti-democratic bans within the political labour movement (which, it is worth recalling, was only imposed now twenty years ago by a majority of 1,804,000 against 1,540,000), and to allow procedure to be conducted and issues to be decided by the democratic methods of free discussion, free elections and majority vote. The removal of the bans over the greater part of the trade union movement has been followed by the enormous growth of trade unionism to record heights of strength and vigorous activity, in contrast to the relative decline of the political movement under the constriction of its anti-democratic strait-waistcoat. The victory of democracy in the political labour movement would lead to a corresponding advance in its strength, unity and vigorous life and activity.

**Political Conclusions for Britain**

The prospect of the Crimea programme is a long-term prospect. It

PRODUCED 2009 BY ONZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will govern the future for many years, both for the general development of world politics, along the lines of international co-operation and democratic advance, and for the political situation within each country. This applies with special force to Britain as one of three principal Powers responsible for world leadership in carrying forward this programme. No country more than Britain, with the serious new problems which it has to face in the changed world situation, has vital need of the policies of international co-operation, peace and progressive advance envisaged in the Crimea decisions. The battle against fascism and reaction will not end with the military defeat of Hitler; the coming years will be critical; and it is precisely the successes already won which provide the basis for further advance. It will be essential to ensure the broadest unity of all supporters of the Crimea policies against every form of reactionary opposition. The methods of achieving this will require the most careful consideration.

**General Election and After**

The coming general election, on the basis of the Government's declaration, will be fought on party lines. It will provide the opportunity to revitalise the present obsolete parliament, and to ensure a democratic progressive anti-fascist majority pledged to support of the Crimea policy and to carry forward the social changes which are imperative in Britain. It is of vital importance to establish labour and progressive electoral unity in the coming general election in order to win such a majority. On the basis of such a majority the conditions will be most favourable to establish a broad-based Government which will be led by the most progressive sections of the nation, which will draw in every political section, in due proportion, that supports the democratic anti-fascist and international policies set out in the Crimea decisions, and will thus be able to organise and carry forward the unity of the nation for the fulfilment of those policies, the completion of the war in the Far East, the tasks of reconstruction and progressive social and economic advance in Britain.

**World Peace and the Causes of War**

Finally the Crimea decisions set out in the forefront the task of establishing machinery to maintain world peace against new aggression and prevent a third world war. This aim is the pivot of the Crimea decisions, as of the Teheran Declaration. But the formulation of this aim in the Crimea decisions reveals a significant development on the formulation at Teheran—a development which illuminates the whole conception of the Crimea programme. The Teheran Declaration expressed the resolve to make a peace which

> will banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations."

"For many generations"—since obviously no machinery can guarantee perpetual peace, but only a deeper social change. But the Crimea formulation sets out:—

> We are resolved upon the earliest possible establishment with our allies of a general international organisation to maintain peace and security. We believe that this is essential both to prevent aggression and to remove the political, economic and social causes of war through the close and continuing collaboration of all peace-loving peoples.

Every Socialist understands that the final abolition of war requires the removal of its causes, that is, a change in the social system. But every serious socialist or Marxist equally understands that this does not mean that it is useless to fight against war or strive to prevent it until the social system has been changed, but that on the contrary it is essential to mobilise all the democratic forces of the peoples in the struggle against war and to prevent war, precisely in order to carry

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through the social changes which can alone finally abolish the causes of war.

The decisions adopted at the Crimea Conference not only show the practical way forward on the most pressing immediate questions which confront the nations today. The Crimea policies, at the same time, through the firm measures for the destruction of fascism, through the strengthening of democracy and through the policies of international co-operation, offer the most favourable conditions for the advance of the peoples to tackle all the problems before them and carry through extending social change. The Crimea policies offer the most favourable conditions for the advance to the final victory of all the aims of the labour movement.

R. P. D.

22 *February*, 1945.

# The World Trade Union Conference

## The London Conference will hasten the total defeat of Fascism in Germany and throughout the world

## I.

### by B. FRACHON

*(Secretary of the French C.G.T.)*

THE World Labour Conference which has just been held in London can, without exaggeration, be called an historic event.

It is the first time in the history of the labour movement that a conference has brought together so large a number of central trade union organisations from every part of the world.

Its foremost characteristic is thus that it was a truly international conference.

It met in the midst of war, and it is no small thing that the delegates reached unanimity on the subject of carrying forward and increasing the war effort with a view to hastening the military, political and moral defeat of fascism in Germany and in all the countries of the world.

It is in the working-class—the class which at once makes, and has made, the greatest contribution to freedom's titanic struggle against the barbarism and enslavement of fascist dictatorship and suffers most from the war—that is found the most stubborn and unqualified resolution to continue the fight until complete and unconditional victory is won.

The absence of any divergence of views on the object to be achieved, among the delegates of such a variety of countries and the admission by universal consent of representatives of unions from countries still under fascist domination to play their part in the work of the Conference, combine to give a really significant stamp to the war. It is at one and the same time a just war, a world war for freedom and progress, and a national war of independence for each nation invaded or threatened by the fascist armies.

But the Conference has not only demonstrated the determination of the working masses to crush their mortal enemy for good; it has also shown that they intend to throw their whole weight into the task of establishing a just and lasting peace. The resolution passed, after thorough discussion, on this point of the agenda, shows that the movement understands perfectly what terms of peace the workers de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mand. Thanks to the work done in London, the world trade union movement will be able to attend the Conferences which will settle the conditions of peace and its participation will be of the greatest value.

But the splendid resolutions which were passed would have no more than symbolic value if the Conference had not forged the instrument to make them a reality. This it did not fail to do, for it laid the foundations of a new, a genuine, trade union international.

The delegates combined to express the powerful urge for unity which exists among the workers of all lands, and it is now certain that the next world conference will definitely establish the new international organisation. And in the meantime the bodies set up by the Conference can act with all the authority they derive from the unanimous votes of the delegates.

Nevertheless, it would be a serious mistake to imagine that the battle is over merely because the Conference has come up to the hopes of even the most optimistic. Its decisions and the actions of the committee which it has set up will only have full effect if they are supported by tens, by hundreds, of millions of workers. Our task is now to publicise its results, to make its resolutions and decisions known to everybody, to have them debated and to show the workers how they must be applied in everyday life.

The London Conference has given to all militant workers a splendid working tool; may they understand how to use it. For each one of them the slogan must be:—

Not a place, not a shop, in which the splendid decisions of the World Labour Conference are not known, discussed, and applied.

## II.

## by ERNEST THORNTON

### (*Chairman of Australian Delegation*)

THE greatest gathering of organised labour ever held has just concluded its deliberations. From all angles the World Trade Union Conference must be considered a tremendous success.

From practically every country not occupied by the Axis came delegates, speaking different languages, belonging to a score of races, holding various religious opinions, but all united in a determination to prevent any further wars, to root out fascism wherever it appears and to build world unity of labour in spirit and in organisation.

Time and time again it was shown in the Conference that delegates had learned the lesson administered by the rise of fascism and the subsequent war; there existed a real determination to prevent disunity in the ranks of the workers ever assisting reaction again.

There were widely separated points of view at this conference. These were shown first on the question of Poland and secondly on the problem of building a new trade union international.

On the Polish matter it was evident that the British T.U.C. delegation was determined not to allow the admission of a delegate from inside Poland, as that might have been interpreted as an attempt to force the British Government to recognise the Lublin Provisional Government. The great majority at the Conference held the opposite point of view, that an invitation to the Poles to attend would hearten them and give encouragement to those who were rebuilding the trade union movement. No better example of the desire for unity can be given than in the action of the majority in agreeing that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the proposal to invite the Poles be dropped.

Then again, on the question of a new international: the overwhelming majority desired a completely new organisation free from the traditions of the old International Federation of Trade Unions. Many of the delegations were very hostile to the I.F.T.U., particularly the French. Yet no showdown was allowed to develop between the majority and the British delegation which, together with a small group of European delegates, supported the I.F.T.U. In fact, right through the Conference there were many examples of the tolerance and generosity of a majority towards a minority. Not once was there a real test in which voting strength was called upon.

Lombardo Toledano, from the Latin American Confederation of Labour, led the demand for the destruction of fascism—wherever it appeared and no matter what disguise of name or party form it adopted; and the call put forward by the Soviet delegation for stern measures against Germany to prevent further aggression was accepted by the Conference without any of the reservations about "reparations in kind" heard recently in certain quarters.

It is clear from this Conference that the years of resistance to the invader on the part of the French and other resistance movements has weeded out the weaklings and has produced trade union organisations with a new spirit. This spirit, felt all the time at the Conference, will be a big factor in the new international. In this connection, the decision to make Paris the headquarters of the Administrative Committee which is to function until the next Conference is of great importance.

Altogether, the success of this Conference exceeded the expectations of the most optimistic.

## III.

## by S. A. DANGE

***(Leader of the Delegation of the All-India Trade Union Congress to the World Trade Union Conference)***

THROUGH years of stress and strife, the working-class of the world has been driving towards unity in *action*. The task was to bring that unity into *organisation*. The World Trade Union Conference has laid the foundations for that unity.

But the task is not finished; it has only begun. The forces of disunity are still numerous enough to hinder the solidification of those foundations and the building of a new structure. Only the correct and conscious understanding and action of the working-class can beat them finally.

One of the danger spots of disunity is the failure to appreciate, or inadequate appreciation, of the role of the colonial working-class.

This World Conference was, perhaps, the first international gathering of Labour, where such a large delegation of the colonial and subject countries was present and made its presence usefully felt. Africans, Indians, Jews, Arabs, Cypriots, Jamaicans, etc.—all those who belonged to a subject country or community gravitated towards one another and lent their tone to the whole atmosphere.

Legitimately enough, the Conference was dominated by the problems of war—and especially the war against Nazi Germany.

While the peoples and working-class of the colonies were wholeheartedly against Nazi Germany, it had to be pointed out that the subjuga-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of the colonial peoples and the presence there of bureaucratic governments (as in India) made the full effective mobilisation of the people there difficult, if not impossible.

While discussing the problems of peace and the post-war world, it had to be pointed out that monopoly capitalism and colonies have been one of the origins of war and a post-war world based on subjection of colonies would be insecure.

The unity of the working-class was shown when the Conference resolved "to bring to an end the system of colonies . . ." and to lay the foundations "of a world order in which non-self-governing communities and nations can attain the status of free nations. . . ."

That declaration saved the Conference from being used by the enemies of unity to draw the workers of the subject countries away from unity with the workers of democratic countries in the new World Federation of Trade Unions.

And it was not an accident that those who had opposed the growing unity symbolised by this Conference and had tried to build an anti-progressive, anti-Soviet corner in the Conference, opposed the inclusion of this principle in the declarations of the Conference.

We from the colonies had also a responsibility. While remembering our special task, the liberation of our own subject people, we had to see that we did not become national-sectarians and forget to see our common bonds with the working-class of all countries and the common danger to mankind —Nazism. And we did *not* forget.

By its very composition, determined in a very *ad hoc* manner, the Conference had its limitations. Old mummies of the pre-war period, embalmed and preserved in the generous vaults of refugee London, tried to claim place in the living new world as big as the weight of the pyramids that had been built round them. They even threatened to obstruct. But what pyramid, however tall, can obstruct the progress of the Flying Fortress of the new working-class, piloted by a leadership born and steeled in the struggle? *The new Federation is a reality. It cannot be out-voted by the dead.*

## IV.

## by WILL LAWTHER

***(President of the National Union of Mineworkers)***

THE most super-optimist could not have possibly forecast the great success achieved at the World Trade Union Conference.

As one who considered it likely that success would result from the holding of the Conference and as one who, perhaps, played a small part in bringing about the Conference, I can express the view that I am more than delighted. My views before the Conference took place were expressed in a special article published in *War and the Working Class.*

I rejoice that my colleagues of the Congress of Industrial Organisations and the trade unions of the U.S.S.R. have been able to establish a real link with the British trade union movement through the General Council of the T.U.C.

The big issue at Conference was whether the dreams of the pioneers of the working-class would be realised, or whether they would remain just dreams. It is true to say that the first real steps towards the goal set by the pioneers have been taken along lines that they could never have imagined.

Every industrial union was present at the Conference, together with many semi-industrial unions. Many preju-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dices that had grown with the traditions of the labour movement were overcome.

Prominent for the British T.U.C. were Sir Walter Citrine, C. N. Gallie, of the Railway Clerks Association, and Arthur Deakin, Transport and General Workers Union. Citrine was given the important job of being in charge of the Conference Secretariat and he also played a big part in the debates, particularly that on the new World Trade Union Federation.

The Russians, led by likeable Vasilli Kuznetsov, made a deep impression. There were 35 Soviet delegates and every one was a hard worker. Each will report back personally to his or her union.

The Americans were a healthy influence. The general run of delegates carefully considered the words of Sidney Hillman, R. H. Thomas, Reid Robinson and big Joe Curran.

Lombardo Toledano, representing the Latin-American countries, was a big hit. This man is going to be a power to be reckoned with in the international labour movement.

The four big decisions were:—

(1) Steps to build a new trade union international.

(2) Speed the allied war effort.

(3) Trade union representation at the peace table.

(4) Recommendations on post-war reconstruction.

It was found possible to get unity on all these questions. Why? There were two basic reasons. The first was a violent hatred of fascism among all the delegates and the second, the deep desire to bring lasting peace, freedom and progress for all peoples.

The big thing that emerged from the Conference is a growing realisation on the part of the trade unions that they must get together, whatever the difficulties.

It was a pity that women, who have played such a valiant part in the war effort, should have been so thinly represented. There were present seven Russian women, one British and one South African. The rest of the 260 delegates were men, representing roughly 60,000,000 organised workers in upwards of forty countries.

It is now the business of every member of the British working-class to seek inside the political movement the same unity achieved by the T.U.C. in the trade union field.

Finally, I think it is important to mention that during the Conference the first meeting of the reconstructed Mineworkers' International was held. This augurs well for the future.

---

*The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.*

*The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.*

*SUBSCRIPTION RATES; United Kingdom, 12 months 7s. Postage paid. Abroad, 8s. Two weeks' notice is required for change of address.*

*A stencilled Discussion Guide to the magazine is available to readers at 3/- a year inclusive of postage.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Reparations

## by MAURICE DOBB

THE Agreement at the Crimea Conference states that the Three Powers "have considered the question of damage caused by Germany to Allied Nations in this war and recognise it as just that Germany be obliged to make compensation for the damage in kind to the greatest extent possible." A Reparations Commission will sit in Moscow to "consider the question of the extent and methods for compensating damage caused by Germany."

Yet in the labour movement there remains a feeling in certain circles, as was shown by some speeches at the last T.U.C., that reparations are something inherently undesirable and impracticable, doing as much, if not more, damage to the receiving than to the paying country, and especially to the working-class of the former, by the unemployment they create. This attitude is largely fruit of the controversy which raged after the Treaty of Versailles and of the opposition at that time of most sections of the labour movement to reparation-payments. This opposition was in part an objection to them as an incident of the larger Versailles settlement, in part an objection to reparations *per se*, in part an objection only to the excessive figure at which the reparation-demands on Germany had been fixed. Marxist criticism of reparations at the time was primarily that they were part of a mechanism of control over Germany, by the aid of which she was to be made into a dependent bastion in Central Europe against Bolshevism.

The tendency to argue today on the basis of analogies with the situation after 1918 ignores the major differences between the two periods. First, there are major differences in the political situation between the period of Versailles and the period following the Teheran and Crimea conferences, with which it is not the province of this article to deal. Secondly, there are important differences in the economic situation as well. Chief of these is the fact that Soviet economists have proposed, and the Crimea statement explicitly states, that reparations shall be paid *in kind* (i.e., by direct labour performed or by the delivery of actual materials and products). Under the Versailles Treaty there were some deliveries in kind: namely, delivery of ships and also of coal (up to a maximum of 20 million tons annually) to repair the loss incurred by France through war-damage to her mines in the Nord and Pas de Calais (a provision which, incidentally, Mr. Keynes, in his famous indictment of the peace treaty, referred to as "a reasonable provision if it stood by itself and one which Germany should be able to fulfil"). But the bulk of the payments under the Versailles settlement were to be made in money. A further difference is that in the post-war world there is clearly going to be much more ordered planning of economic relations in general, and of reparation deliveries in particular, than ever existed in the 1920s. Finally, there is the important consideration today that the countries that will be the recipients are the U.S.S.R. and the other war-ravaged and devastated countries of the European continent, who without such reparation will be exceedingly hard put to it to restore their economic systems to anything like normal working, at least for many years to come.

In the 1920s there was a good deal of somewhat inconclusive discussion among economists about the essential reason for the breakdown of reparation payments, and (on a more theoretical level) as to what essentially constitutes the so-called *Transfer Problem*

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(in the sense of limits to the transfer of sums of money across national frontiers which would not apply if the payment were made directly in kind). Some argued, by making very abstract assumptions, which had only very scanty resemblance to the real world, that there was no essential difference between payments in money and payments in kind: that fundamentally they would come to the same thing, despite the difference of mechanism, provided that there were no obstacles to trade or to the smooth working of the monetary system. It was a common saying in economic text-books and dissertations that, in the last analysis, reparations would be paid in goods or gold. If initially there were obstacles to the former, gold would flow,* which would tend to have the effect of lowering prices in the paying country and raising the price-level in the receiving country, until the price-difference was sufficient to cause goods to flow from the former to the latter. Thus the requisite export-surplus would be evoked.

It is quite true that part of the reason why reparations broke down in the 1920s (in fact, over the second half of the decade Germany was paying in reparations less than she was borrowing from abroad, chiefly by loans floated in America†) was because other countries put up high tariff-barriers which had the effect of keeping out German exports, and hence made it difficult for Germany by increasing her sales abroad to acquire the foreign *valuta* (resources or deposits in foreign money) which she had to obtain in order to make reparation-payments in money to France or Belgium or Britain (and if she could not realise such sums by selling more exports, her attempt to buy these foreign currencies with marks was bound to set in motion a depreciation of the foreign-exchange value of the mark). But it is also true, quite apart from these special obstacles to trade, that, in the actual conditions of a capitalist world, the attempt suddenly to increase the export-surplus of a country must so disrupt foreign markets (because more goods are pushed on them to absorb) as to bring about a sharp fall in price; this fall in price having the double effect of producing trade depression in the country receiving the goods, and at the same time making it more difficult, or even impossible (if the foreign market is very inelastic) for the exporting country to increase the *value* of its exports, however much it may increase their physical *quantity*.* To the ex-

* This is assuming that the countries were on a gold standard. If not, the fall in foreign exchange rates (caused by making reparation-payments) were assumed to have a similar effect; the altered exchange-rate between the monies of the two countries cheapening exports in the paying country in terms of the other country's money.

† Between 1924 and the final Hoover moratorium on payments in 1932, German reparation payments in cash and kind totalled £500 million, while her net balance of foreign indebtedness for loans made to her increased by £900 million. (*C.f.*, Lloyd George, *The Truth about Reparations and War Debts*, 87.)

* Some have argued that this difficulty is imaginary because at the same time (approximately) as the paying country is expanding its exports, the receiving country is acquiring funds as reparation-payments, so that the *demand* of the latter country will simultaneously increase, since it is better off. But if, say, the French Government receives $x$ million francs from Germany in reparations, it by no means follows that the French business man or French consumer will increase his purchases of the sort of goods Germany exports by an amount equal to $x$ million francs. *Even* if the French Government lowers its taxation by an equivalent amount, the French business man or peasant may save the difference, or alternatively spend more on home-produced goods.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tent that this is so, there *does* exist a special "transfer problem" attaching to payment of reparations in *money* which does *not* necessarily exist if reparations are paid in kind.

But, if Germany supplies machine-tools to Czechoslovakia and U.S.S.R., or sends workers to rebuild Kharkov, will not this just the same narrow the market which there might otherwise have been in these countries for the products of the English engineering industry? Will it not (as Sir George Paish writes in the *Daily Mail* of February 14) even cause Russian workers to be unemployed in Kharkhov? So far as Kharkhov is concerned, the answer is the simple one that Sir George Paish has overlooked the difference between *laissez-faire* capitalism and a planned socialist economy. In the latter there is not, as there is in the former, a "ceiling" to effective demand and to employment. And if there is no such ceiling, it does not follow that, if part of the demand is satisfied by German labour, there will be less employment left over for Russian labour. The simple fact is that if Russian labour does not have to be employed on rebuilding Kharkhov, it will be available for some other purpose, perhaps for restarting the Dneiper Dam or building the Volga-Don canal or building new clothing factories. Since the volume of industrial activity is governed by the Plan, and the situation will be one where labour is scarce and not jobs (as it was also throughout the pre-war decade) there is no doubt that, if there is labour to spare, it will be so employed. The only thing capable of preventing it from being so employed would be *deficiency of materials and tools* with which labour could work. In other words, the quicker the basic needs of reconstruction are met (e.g., by reparations) the *more* employment is there likely to be for Russian labour, and not less.

What is true of building Kharkhov is also true by analogy of Russian demand for the products of British industry. What would make U.S.S.R. a poor market for British goods would be the inability of her industry and agriculture to produce enough for her to be able to "spare" exports with which to pay for imports. What would *depress* the buying-power of the liberated countries would be their poverty; and the quicker their prosperity is restored, the sooner will they be able to afford to buy things from abroad. If German machine-tools go to re-equip the dismantled industries of the Ukraine or Czechoslovakia or Poland, then these industries will the sooner be in a position to produce goods for export, and hence will the sooner be able to buy goods from Britain and elsewhere which they previously couldn't afford—including, probably, more machine-tools to feed the expansion of their own industries, which will be able to proceed more, and not less, quickly, once the basic reconstruction is achieved.

The fallacy behind Sir George Paish's conception is that he continues to think in terms of a fixed "fund" of purchasing power, and consequently a fixed quota of jobs to go round; from which it seems to follow that if Germans get the job of rebuilding Kharkhov or re-equipping its tractor-works, some Russian or Englishman must be odd-man-out; and that in the Alice - through - the - Looking - Glass world of economics it is always more advantageous to give than to receive. But it may well be asked whether this conception does not correspond to the situation in capitalist countries, even if it no longer does to Russia. If reparations are paid to France, won't this reduce her dependence on exports from Britain? To this there is, again, the answer that even here the situation is very different from what it was in the 1920s. This country and U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and presumably most of the liberated countries, will be doing their best to promote policies of full employment after the war; and in so far as they succeed in this, the picture of a rigid "purchasing-power-and-job fund" will not apply. Useful work will be financed and started to employ the man-power that is available, and if some of this work of reconstruction is done by German labour, then French or British labour can be released to meet other development-needs that come lower in the priority-list of useful work to be done.

But what of the argument that the burden of reparations may undesirably reduce the standard of life of the German people, and possibly exhaust her economic life, and be objectionable for this reason? The fact which many people seem to overlook is that the burden of rebuilding shattered towns and re-equipping dismantled factories has got to fall on *someone*. Someone's labour has got to repair the devastation, and someone's standard of life has got to be reduced while labour is diverted to this task. The issue is not between burden or no-burden (as though it were being imposed for penal reasons), but on whose shoulders the burden will rest. Is it to be the shoulders of Russians and Poles and Czechs and Frenchmen, who have suffered the torments of occupation, died in concentration camps and shed their blood in the resistance movement, or the shoulders of Germans who have tolerated (to say the least) the Nazi regime, shared in its loot of Europe, and need to "work their passage home" before there can "be a place for them in the comity of nations"? About the answer to such a question none but a pro-fascist could, surely, be in doubt? Of course, it is clear that only a part of the devastation wrought by war and by the Nazis can be repaired by this means. If even part of the devastation is to be made good by reparations, it will have to be intelligently arranged and subordinated to a global plan which takes the whole European situation under its scrutiny. But when things are calculated in kind and the problem thought of in real terms—in so-many man-hours and so-many lorries and locomotives and machine-tools—the chance of "astronomical calculations" and unreal "strings of noughts" will be very much less than when the whole matter is seen "through the veil of money." Lest anyone, however, should deny that there is surplus productive-power in Germany to be tapped, there is this fact to be borne in mind. For some ten years now Germany has been building an immense war industry, which had no parallel in 1918. This has not been producing for the needs of ordinary civilian consumption or for the normal needs of industrial equipment: it has been producing for war. In this sense a large fraction of Germany's productive-power is surplus; and the equipment of this war industry (where it has not been destroyed by bombing) will either be dismantled or adapted to peace-time purposes. A substantial proportion of it must be adaptable; and this part represents one potential source of productive-power from which reparations can be drawn.

A feature of the Crimea agreement that one welcomes with particular satisfaction is that reparations are no longer to be a plaything of bankers, as they became twenty years ago; and one can afford to smile, perhaps, at the chagrin which this must be causing in certain quarters in London and New York. In this connection, it is amusing to note the alternative to reparations in kind which Sir George Paish suggests in the article cited above. His suggestion is that the capital sum of reparations should be funded, and a loan issued to this amount on the guarantee of the United Nations and sold to nationals of this country and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America. The liability for paying the interest and debt charges on the loan would be laid upon Germany. In other words, British and American labour would repair the yawning gaps in Europe's economic life (and do so precisely in those years when wartime scarcities still continue here as well as on the continent) while all that German labour was set to do would be to supply £50 million odd of annual income to British and American bondholders and to bankers and stockbrokers in London and Wall Street who took their rake-off on the roundabout deal!

# Crimea and the Liberation of Europe

## by QUAESTOR

THE decisions of the Crimea Conference, held at Yalta, February 4-11, have mapped out the path forward for the liberation of Europe. They have fully agreed the detailed military plans for the final defeat of the common enemy "by new and even more powerful blows . . . from east, west, north and south." They have shown the decisive task for the aim of liberation to be the fulfilment of "our inflexible purpose to destroy German militarism and Nazism", so as to ensure that Germany "will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world." At the same time, they have shown the way forward for the European peoples to destroy the last vestiges of fascism and to exercise their democratic rights.

The central and basic question is the crushing of German militarism. Already the World Trade Union Conference, representing sixty million organised workers, without dissent or division, had voiced their demand. The Crimea Declaration* has now definitely and explicitly set down what must be done: occupation by forces of U.S.A., Britain, U.S.S.R. and France; total disarmament of Germany; elimination or control of her war industries and war potential; punishment of all war criminals; reparations in kind for destruction; eradication of the Nazi Party, its laws and institutions; removal of Nazi and militarist influences from public offices and from cultural and economic life.

The carrying out of these policies and plans requires the united support of the whole people. The Crimea decisions must be fought for, against all attempts at opposition, whittling down, undermining. Previous controversy has shown the existence of such an opposition in some quarters, as well as misconceptions and misunderstanding, with regard to the necessary measures in relation to Germany after its military defeat.

For example, it is asserted that it would be much better if the roots of aggression were destroyed in Germany by the German people themselves. On that there is no disagreement. But the German workers have not taken advantage of their opportunity even to begin the struggle against Nazi tyranny. While Poles and Czechs, Norwegians and Danes and Luxemburgers, French and Italians and Yugoslavs did fight Hitler—each starting in the measure open to them, but all passing to fiercer means as the years went on—the German people were passive: and, being passive, shared in the loot, while their sons and brothers and husbands at the front joined by scores of thousands in the bestial atrocities planned by Hitler. The fact that Red Army men have had to restrain German women found

* See Document of the Month p. 92.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pillaging their own countrymen speaks volumes for the depth of corruption of the German people.

That does not accord with theory based on wishful thinking. But there are many well-known cases in history when great socialist leaders like Marx and Engels and Lenin advised Socialists to be prepared to supplement and fill out their theory (based on previous experience in different conditions) with new facts supplied by the march of events. Lenin wrote a special "Letter on Tactics" after the revolution of March, 1917, to explain this very point.

Moreover, regrettably forgotten though it may have been for many years, Marx and Engels themselves pointed out the special danger to the world which resided in Prussia-Germany (as it arose in history)—"a capitalist society which has not yet formally subjected the state to its rule, which must leave the real governance to an hereditary monarchist-bureaucratic junker caste" (Engels' letter to Bebel, February 19, 1892). In this state, and this before it became imperialist, Engels was warning the Socialists against the "hereditary German evil" which might paralyse the German working-class in its fight, even though it then had "hardly anything at all of this hereditary German disease about it"—the poison of petty-bourgeois philistinism "sister to servility, abject subservience and all the hereditary German vices" (Letter to Bernstein, March 1, 1883). Many years before, in a usually overlooked chapter of the immortal Communist Manifesto itself (1847), Marx and Engels had given a biting and strangely modern description of this petty-bourgeois philistinism which then called itself "German Socialism." It "proclaimed the German nation to be the model nation, and the German petty philistine to be the typical man. To every villainous meanness of this model man it gave a hidden, higher, socialistic interpretation, the exact contrary of its real character. It went to the extreme length of directly opposing the 'brutally destructive' tendency of Communism, and of proclaiming its supreme and impartial contempt of all class struggles."

This philistine streak was preserved in its entirety by the peculiar form of capitalist state described by Engels in 1892. During the twenty-five years of imperialist development which Kaiser Germany went through thereafter, it had widened and deepened. War experiences in 1914-18 showed considerable sections of the German working-class heavily infected with it.

Capitalist and junker white terror and Social-Democratic kowtowing to Prussianism after 1918—both eagerly encouraged by besotted British, French and American Big Business—had the upper hand of surviving revolutionary strains among the German workers during the next fifteen years. And the bloody terror of Hitlerism—favoured by the same Great Powers until it was too late—further weakened the militant forces of the German people, murdering, bludgeoning, starving and terrorising millions into passivity.

Yet even then no one could have guessed the full measure of moral degradation and acquiescence into which this fatal sequence had plunged the overwhelming majority of the German people — until this war brought the horrible proofs. Could there be anything more devastating, from the socialist point of view, than the fact that the German working-class, once the best organised in Europe, has co-operated without any serious opposition in the most ferocious war against the first socialist state in history?

To recognise this is hard: but there is no other way, for it is part of the essential background of the European

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

situation. It is the background on which the European peoples have to consider how to protect themselves against a still more frightful repetition of this third German imperialist outbreak in 75 years. To put it plainly, even if some movement of revolt were to begin among the German workers in this final stage of the European war, it could be only a subordinate factor in the present settlement—whatever its later importance. No one who remembers the seas of blood, the unspeakable nightmare of misery, the boundless area of destruction, which the Nazis have left behind them all over Europe, can fail to understand this.

As the Crimea Conference declared, "It is not our purpose to destroy the people of Germany, but only when Nazism and militarism have been extirpated will there be hope for a decent life for Germans and a place for them in the comity of nations."

A witty French commentator recently used this formula about Eastern Europe: "De-Germanisation = Democratisation"; and it is a pregnant saying. A triple barrier to democracy was erected all over Europe during the hundred years after 1848, as was pointed out in these columns some months ago. In 1848-9 the reactionary army of Russian Tsardom saved Prussian and Austrian absolutism, and with it the rule of aristocratic landowners all over Central and Eastern Europe. In 1919-21, after the fall of Tsardom, Allied imperialism threw up a "sanitary cordon against Bolshevism" in the same countries, by setting up or consolidating the terrorist dictatorship of both landowners and big business in every country from Finland and the Baltic States to the Balkans and Italy. From 1933 to 1939 Anglo-French statesmanship, in the Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain period, reinforced this cordon by helping Hitler to consolidate a new absolutism in Germany, and by encouraging the propertied classes as far west as France and Spain, and as far east as Turkey, to accept his influence.

Today it is all three barriers which are crashing in ruins, under the combined blows of the Allied armies striking at Germany from East and West, and the resistance movements striking at the power of quislings, collaborators and pre-war Hitlerites in their own country.

This is the main key to the seemingly wildly diverse pattern of liberation politics all over Europe. This is why the three great Allies at Yalta drew up their Declaration on Liberated Europe, providing that in future their policies will be concerted, and that any action they may take in meeting the political and economic problems of liberation will be joint action. In addition, the assurance is given that such action and such assistance will be "in accordance with democratic principles" and in consultation with the other governments or provisional authorities concerned.

Obviously each country has its special problems and path peculiar to itself. But to each and all of them, whether liberated States or foreign Axis satellite States, the same principle extends of the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government. On this basis the peoples of Europe may well hail the ringing final words of Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin:—

"By this Declaration we reaffirm our faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, our pledge in the Declaration by the United Nations, and our determination to build, in co-operation with other peace-loving nations a world order under law, dedicated to peace, security, freedom, and the general well-being of all mankind."

DIGITISED 2008 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The Bulgarian Trials

## by MICHAEL PADEV

ON December 20, 1944, the Bulgarian people's courts began the trials of over 3,000 Bulgarian war criminals. These included Prince Cyril, the former Regent, over sixty ministers, two to three dozen generals, over one hundred deputies and several hundred Nazi leaders, Gestapo agents and police chiefs. Two central courts in Sofia dealt with the major war criminals, while in the provinces forty-six courts are trying the local adherents of the former fascist regime.

On February 1 the two Sofia central courts sentenced to death the three ex-Regents, including Prince Cyril, twenty-two former ministers and sixty-eight deputies. The law governing the people's courts provides for the immediate enforcement of the sentences passed by the courts, which cannot be commuted, altered or postponed by the government, and these sentences were, accordingly, carried out next morning. In Sofia a crowd of 150,000 assembled in front of the Palace of Justice to express its approval of the courts' decisions. In Moscow, to quote the B.B.C. correspondent, Paul Winterton, they were received with "quiet satisfaction." "The really interesting thing about the trial," Winterton added, was that Bulgaria was the "first country to tackle the question of its war criminals in a really big way from the top down." The "big shots," the representative of the monarchy included, found their way into the dock in the same way as did the "small fry" of police torturers and Gestapo agents. It is expected that the courts will have concluded their activities in two months' time.

The trial and punishment of the Bulgarian fascists and war criminals was always one of the most important points in the programme of the resistance movement, known as the Fatherland Front. When the Fatherland Front came to power on September 9, 1944, it lost no time in enacting the law which provided for the setting up of the People's Courts and in bringing before them the members of the former regime charged by the prosecution. These men had already been arrested by the People's Militia (the partisans' police force). Not a single war criminal escaped arrest and very few fell victim to the angry crowds in the first days after the downfall of the fascist regime. The Militia, although composed of men who in the past had suffered horribly at the hands of the fascist police, showed as much restraint as it did efficiency.

Roughly speaking, Bulgaria's war criminals can be divided into three categories:—

(1) The former leading members of the fascist government responsible for the country's alliance with Germany and the consequent declarations of war against the Allies, occupation of Greek and Yugoslav territories, provocations to the Soviet Union, etc. These include the former Regents, headed by Prince Cyril, all those who were ministers between January, 1941, and September, 1944, all the Palace councillors, both official and unofficial, all the deputies in the "Parliament" who approved this policy and also all the fascist propagandists in the press.

(2) Members of former governments, of government departments, state and private banks and business firms, and also individuals who, on their own initiative, became the agents for Germany's policy of economic enslavement of Bulgaria. This group includes ministers who, because bribery made it worth their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while, signed financial agreements with Germany detrimental to Bulgaria's interests, and bankers who issued paper money on German orders without even registering the amount of notes issued.

(3) Bulgarian army commanders, government officials, police officials, provincial governors, members of military courts, etc., who are guilty of murder, either by ordering political assassinations in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia or Greece, or by executing such orders, or by taking part in expeditions against the partisans, in the destruction of villages, in the torture of democratic politicians, in the organisation of concentration camps, etc. In other words, this group embodies the entire staff, senior and junior, of the fascist terror police system.

Of course, many criminals, especially the major ones, belong in all three categories. Prince Cyril and his other two Regents, Generals Mihov and Filov, could not, for example, deny that in Sofia alone they had approved 412 death sentences of opposition leaders. In the early months of 1944 their Cabinet voted a special credit out of which large monetary rewards to be paid to any member of the police and gendarmerie who could show "a head chopped off a partisan." One minister pleaded in court that he had been opposed to this "system" of beheading. (The head itself was exhibited for three weeks in the partisan's native village so that his relations and friends should think twice before following his example. The removal or burial of the heads was punishable by death.) But it transpired that all he meant was that after they had been exhibited he had wanted the heads to be "burnt instead of buried, so that the village dogs should not dig them out."

In all, 29,480 people fell victim to the fascist terror in Bulgaria and 2,700 houses were destroyed by the police in reprisals against the families of partisans. It is hardly surprising that feelings run high and that the trials are followed with intense interest throughout the whole country.

All the trials are public and the main proceedings in Sofia were broadcast over the radio. The evidence given by the accused and the defence presented by their lawyers were published in full. In the provinces the court proceedings were relayed by loudspeaker to the huge crowds that had assembled from the surrounding villages to be present at them.

Politically, the trials revealed the complete bankruptcy of the former regime. It now appears that in the last few years of his life King Boris belonged to an obscure religious sect, the "prophet" of which, a man named Lulchev, was his chief adviser and accompanied him even to Berchtesgaden. Other Court Councillors revealed that the chief preoccupation of both Boris and Cyril was to "keep Russian influence away from the Balkans" and to concentrate their system of persecution against the Workers (Communist) Party. With very few exceptions all the fascist leaders and war criminals, including Prince Cyril—who had the greatest difficulty in expressing himself in Bulgarian before the court—proved as lacking in courage as they had been in other qualities, eager to cast the blame for their crimes on to another's shoulders and to protest that they were, at heart, sincere democrats. One Nikola Zahariev, a former minister and Agrarian leader, guilty of personally directing anti-partisan activities, approving death sentences, embezzling public funds and forcibly deporting Bulgarian workers to Germany, even went so far as to declare that he had only behaved so abominably because he hated the Germans and Boris's monarchy and had wanted thus to compromise them irreparably in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eyes of the people, in order that the cause of the Fatherland Front might triumph!

The interrogation of the Regents and ministers has revealed several diplomatic secrets of great international importance. At the end of November, 1940, for example, the Soviet government sent Bobolev, the General Secretary of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, to see King Boris. Bobolev proposed to him that they sign a Soviet-Bulgarian pact of mutual assistance. I well remember the occasion, as I myself reported it to a London paper whose correspondent in Bulgaria I then was. This Soviet proposal, which was greeted throughout the country with intense enthusiasm (over one million signatures advocating its acceptance were collected), has been regarded until now by many competent observers in the West as "pure Communist propaganda." But it was, in fact, one of the most important attempts made by the Soviet Union to thwart German expansion in the Balkans, and had the proposal been accepted by the Bulgarian government Hitler's Balkan plans would certainly have been wrecked. During the present trials in Sofia the original documents of both the Soviet proposal and the Bulgarian government's reply have been produced in court. The treachery, from the purely Bulgarian point of view, of King Boris's foreign policy can be judged from the arrogant note, dated December, 1940, in which his foreign minister rejects the Soviet offer, on the grounds that the Bulgarian government "has promised to enter the Tripartite pact" and "does not want Soviet help in solving Bulgaria's grievances by peaceful means." From this alone it is clear that King Boris' policys was an openly pro-German policy of aggression and war and it is that policy that was faithfully continued after his death by his brother Cyril.

Both internally and externally, the significance of the Bulgarian trials is very great indeed. As *Izvestia* has pointed out, not only does the Fatherland Front government thereby give full proof of its determination to fulfil the armistice terms agreed on by the Allies (which provide for Bulgaria's co-operation in punishing war criminals) but it also provides a guarantee that the fascist tyranny furthered by Bulgaria's German dynasty—to the detriment not only of Bulgaria but of the Balkans as a whole—will not be revived. Last but not least, the trials show that when a genuinely democratic and popular government, such as the Fatherland Front, is in power, the fascists, quislings and Gestapo agents have no hope of surviving, however quickly they may don a "democratic" disguise.

# Housing in Sheffield

## by COUNCILLOR HOWARD HILL

SHEFFIELD, a city of some half million people, living in 148,000 odd premises, has what is probably the finest post-war housing programmes in the country. It estimates there are approximately 40,000 people requiring houses, and has drawn up plans to build the first 20,000 within three years of the end of the war in Europe.

The municipality's most successful year of house building was 1938, when it built a total of 2,976 houses. Basing its programme on these figures, and following the Government's intimation that the first year housing programme should be similar to the last year of building before hostilities broke out, it proposes to build in the first year 3,000 houses, with erection

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the remaining 17,000 houses in the following two years. Already it has secured land sufficient for its first year's programme, at the price of £128 per acre; and is negotiating for a further 4,000 acres, sufficient to accommodate 20,000 houses, 1,000 acres of which it has already secured.

In addition to these permanent houses, it has asked the Government for 2,000 temporary houses (950 of which have already been promised to Sheffield). Sites for these are already being prepared in addition to those for permanent houses. All sites for the temporary houses should be ready from February onwards so that houses can be erected, if the Government provides them by the date promised.

The Council, along with a number of adjacent authorities, has entered into a contract with a large contractor with modern equipment who has been engaged upon the construction of airfields, for the advance preparation of sites for its permanent houses. Work upon the sites, which are sufficient for the first year's programme, should begin within the next few weeks. All this is evidence of the tremendous eagerness with which the Sheffield Labour City Council is getting to grips with its most acute housing shortage.

The gravest doubts, however, exist in the mind of every Sheffield Councillor at the shortcomings in the Government's housing plans. Whilst, no doubt, it has made considerable progress in producing different types of houses, built of materials which lend themselves to rapid construction, and are fairly easy to procure, in every other direction its programme is utterly inadequate.

The Government proposes to build, within the first two years of the war ending in Europe, a paltry 300,000 permanent houses. This, though somewhat compensated for by the 250,000 temporary houses, falls short of the peak pre-war building figures by 440,000. If every authority in Britain is to increase its building programme by the same extent as Sheffield, it is evident not one of them will stand a ghost of a chance of being realised. Already it has been intimated to us (unofficially, of course) that we shall only get a thousand of our first year's programme, whilst the remaining part of the programme may suffer an even worse fate.

The increase in the size of the Government housing programme is dependent upon a number of factors, including labour and materials. The building workers have, however, made it clear that even with the traditional building materials and the pre-war labour force, they can build all the houses the country requires. This will call for the mobilisation of the whole building industry which the Government seems very loath to carry out. Private enterprise is demanding that it be given a free hand to build those types of houses it found most profitable in the pre-war period. But it is essential, for at least one important reason, that all housing comes under the control of the local authority.

The problem of determining a list of priorities for those requiring houses is bristling with difficulties. Who shall have the first houses as they become available? The Servicemen, or families now in grossly overcrowded conditions, many of them in slum property, their children suffering from T.B. and other equally serious diseases? And what about the ordinary civilian couple? No matter how each authority solves this unenviable problem, one thing is clear. Private enterprise must not be permitted to build for people with a couple of hundred pounds to spare. Therefore the Government should make it clear that all post-war housing comes under the control of the local authority. This would mean

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that Sheffield's programme would not be so unrealisable as may be at first imagined. For the total number of houses built both by Private enterprise, independent of the Council and those built by the Council, in the most successful year was 5,808.

Regarding the temporary houses, there is little cause for satisfaction. Sheffield has never been enamoured of temporary houses. They have an unhappy knack of becoming permanent. After the last war the thousands of army huts which were erected in the city to accommodate the munition workers who migrated here, only finally vanished at the beginning of this war. But because of the acute housing shortage, being fully alive to all the difficulties in the way of a rapid solution of the problem, we agreed to the proposed temporary house.

The cause for greatest concern, however, is the proposed rent. The Government regulations state a rent of 10s. per week should be charged. This, with rates, will mean a weekly rental of 15s. or 16s. a week. This, for the provinces, is exceedingly high, especially when it is borne in mind that Sheffield pre-war built a two-bedroom type of house, much more spacious, at an inclusive rental of 8s. 1d. per week.

We are told the internal fitments increase the value of the house to the tenant above the pre-war equivalent. The value of the fitments is estimated at £80 (not pre-war prices) which, if reduced to a weekly figure over ten years—the life of the temporary house—is approximately 3s., which still means the house is 3s. to 4s. more a week than a pre-war equivalent. One further cause for dissatisfaction is that families with more than two children will not be permitted to become tenants. Whilst some relief will be given to young married couples with small families, the terrible overcrowding, particularly amongst the old damp bug-infested property, will hardly be relieved.

Every authority throughout the country is exceedingly perturbed at the costs of post-war building. Of the various types of houses exhibited at Northolt the only one for which an estimated cost has been worked out is the brick house with eleven inch cavity walls. The price is £759, based upon building fifty houses on a site. This is nearly double the cost of pre-war housing.

Four main factors go to make up the cost of housing—land, materials, labour, and interest charges. We in Sheffield are buying land for round about its pre-war price, approximately £10 per house, which, as can be seen, affects very little the housing costs. Materials are up by 120 per cent. Labour costs have risen only 30 per cent., whilst interest rates are now controlled at 3½ per cent. Building materials and interest charges constitute the greatest ratio of costs. For example, after the last war, interest charges were up to 6 per cent., which, for a house costing £800, meant a weekly charge to be met by the tenant, local authority, and Government of 18s. 6d. per week. Even now, with interest rates fixed at 3½ per cent., a house costing £800 will mean a weekly charge of 10s. 9d. The Government seems to have accepted this very high cost of post-war housing and is seeking to pass the extra cost to the tenant and the local authority.

What other interpretation can be placed upon its decision to apply the pre-war subsidy of £5 10s. Government contribution, £2 15s. local authority contribution (which was for a house costing £400) to cover all houses erected in the first two years of building? It would also seem the suggested rent for temporary houses (3s. to 4s. higher than its pre-war equivalent) is but a try-out, in the hope that,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

once accepted as normal, it will form the basis of all post-war rents.

In place of this policy, the Government should immediately take all the necessary steps to force down the cost of building materials to at least the pre-war levels, whilst it should reduce even further the rates of interest to a new low level of 2 per cent. Even with these measures, which should bring housing costs somewhere near the pre-war figure, a far more generous subsidy is needed if the full housing needs of the people are to be satisfied quickly. The pre-war subsidy of £5 10s. per house was amongst the lowest of all subsidies since the end of the last war. With the tremendous losses in rateable value so many authorities have suffered due to enemy action, plus the other heavy financial burdens local authorities will have to bear in other spheres of reconstruction, an increase upon the pre-war subsidy is absolutely essential.

These are the major problems confronting the Sheffield City Council in connection with its building programme. Apart from the steps it can take locally to overcome these problems—which are really very small—they can only be solved in so far as the Government can be forced drastically to revise upwards its whole programme.

In my opinion the Council should come before the people of Sheffield, make known the shortcomings of the Government housing plans which are standing in the way of its own programme being realised, and in this way make it possible for the first post-war pledge of homes for the people to be realised.

# The Soldiers' Vote

## by GROUND STAFF

THE armies of liberation are in serious danger of being disfranchised in their own country. The bulk of the armed forces will be serving overseas when the General Election takes place. Yet, if the Representation of the People Bill, now before Parliament, is to be the last word in the enfranchisement of the serving man, it means that a large proportion of the overseas forces will not be registered voters, will not know their constituencies and will not know the candidates standing. More, the issues before the electors will be substantially unknown to them, and the minority aware of the election issues will only be able to explain them to their colleagues at the risk of offending existing regulations. A bringing about of a radical change in this unsatisfactory position is an urgent task of the progressive movement in this country. American reactionaries, fearful that the soldiers' vote would swing against them, so successfully sabotaged the electoral machinery for the U.S. forces that only one in three of the 7,000,000 servicemen cast their vote in the presidential elections. Vigilance is needed to thwart a similar attempt being made in this country.

The electoral machinery envisaged by the Representation of the People Bill is open to many objections. The Speaker's Conference on Electoral Reform stepped out of its terms of reference and recommended the automatic registration of the service voter. The placid rejection of this suggestion in the Bill, and the throwing of the onus of registration upon the soldier, thus placing him in a less favoured position than the civilian, is bewildering. Every command has the address of the next-of-kin of men serving within its jurisdiction. It would not be an insuperable task to provide this information to the Registrar-General in this country. The postal-voting

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system introduced by the Bill and the proxy vote, except in certain remote areas, are unnecessary and clumsy innovations. The ballot boxes should be taken to the men. In Supply Commands like Paiforce and the Middle East this could easily be achieved and the American elections showed that, when there was a will, this could be done even under more difficult circumstances. Registration officers were dropped by parachute and collected the votes of the men in the front line who were isolated from the main body of the troops. Provided that a longer period than hitherto is allotted to elapse between nomination day and polling day, and provided that constituency maps are prepared now for overseas commands, every serving man could vote in the field knowing the name and party of the candidates in his home constituency.

The present Bill, instead of adapting such simple methods, has introduced such a complicated system that most of the overseas servicemen, if they desire to vote themselves directly by post, will have to register twice. First, if they have not already done so, they will have to register by March 15 on a proxy voting form. Then, some time between March 31 and four days before nomination day, the servicemen will have to make another application to obtain a postal ballot paper. This application will presumably have to be drafted by the soldier, for the Bill does not indicate that the services are going to print and distribute a form for the purpose. Worse, while all that the service postal voter will know about the candidates in his home constituency will have to be obtained in an election address 10 ins. by 7½ ins., the serviceman who is dependent upon a proxy voter will not even know the parties standing in his constituency. With but nine days between nomination day and polling day it will not be possible for a proxy to communicate such information to a serviceman serving overseas. Such fumbling electoral methods are calculated to discredit democratic machinery in the eyes of the serviceman.

The general public is now being lulled by the story that 90 per cent. of the servicemen will be registered by March 15, the closing date. This, it must be clearly understood, is only the pious hope of the service departments. The *Observer* recently quoted 40 per cent. as the figure of overseas forces registered: this is undoubtedly nearer the mark.

No electoral machinery, however, will be of real use unless the serviceman is fully aware of the electoral issues at stake. Men who have served three or four years overseas are out of touch with home problems. They have not access to the national daily papers. The foreign press published in English available to them is only too often doctored to conform with local interest, and the service papers, with a few notable exceptions, deliberately avoid the presentation of policies on party lines. The talks the B.B.C. sends out are rarely heard: the one wireless set a unit generally possesses is invariably put into the crowded and noisy Naafi. More, the overseas serviceman, unlike his colleagues at home, has no opportunity to attend the public meetings of political parties, and has no opportunity to come by current political pamphlets. Even compulsory discussion groups in service time, as are going apace in this country, are as yet almost unknown abroad.

A further hindrance to a free and informed election is the King's Regulation 541 recently reinforced by Grigg with Army Council Instruction 1527. These regulations (and the corresponding R.A.F., K.R., 1092 and Navy K.R., 17A and 18) can be interpreted to prevent any serviceman

PROQUEST 2008 PROQUEST.COM
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

putting forward publicly the point of view of any particular party. They are sufficiently embracing to make a serviceman liable to a charge if he passed on a few Labour Party pamphlets to a serving colleague. This was the regulation the Brigadier Blimps of Cairo exploited to the full in the suppression of the Forces Parliament. As for the new and impudent A.I.C. 1527, it can only have been introduced with an eye to the forthcoming elections, for it warns the soldier not to permit his name "to be added to the public opinions and appeals dealing with political matters."

The time left before the coming election may well be short. Whilst encouraging the serviceman to become registered by March 15, and subsequently to apply for his postal vote, it is nevertheless the responsibility of the labour movement to guard the interests of the fighting forces by insisting upon the fulfilment of the following demands:—

1. The automatic registration of the service voter.

2. The implementing of arrangements for the election to take place by ballot in the field.

3. Full facilities for the serviceman to be aware of the electoral issues by

(*a*) the immediate apportionment of space in the service papers to the political parties, even as wireless time is apportioned at a general election.

(*b*) The immediate extension of compulsory current affairs discussion groups in service time to all the services overseas.

(*c*) Tours to overseas commands by groups of M.Ps., not, as at present, to act as neo-welfare officers, but to explain the political programme of their parties.

(*d*) More wireless sets, as urged in the Munster report, to be sent abroad, together with the official encouragement of listening rooms and tents, as found in this country.

(*e*) Propaganda films made by the political parties at home for distribution to the camp cinemas and travelling film units.

4. The amendment of K.R.541 and the withdrawal of A.I.C. 1527, so that the anachronistic regulations made for a peace-time standing army shall not be used to repress the political freedom of a citizen army.

Churchill has said it would be a disgraceful thing if through a lack of foresight the troops were deprived of the opportunity to understand the politics of the opposing candidates, and of recording their votes on the largest possible scale. It is the duty of the labour movement to see that the required foresight is shown.

## *Document of the Month*

# The Crimea Conference

## Plans for Final Defeat of the Common Enemy

**1. Defeat of Germany**

We have considered and determined the military plans of the three Allied Powers for the final defeat of the common enemy. The Military Staffs of the three Allied Powers have met in daily meetings throughout the conference. These meetings have been most satisfactory from every point of view, and have resulted in closer co-ordination of the military effort of the three Allies than ever before.

The fullest information has been interchanged. The timing, scope and co-ordination of new and even more powerful blows to be launched by our armies and air forces into the heart of Germany from east, west, north and south, have been fully agreed and planned in detail.

Our combined military plans will be made known only as we execute them, but we believe that the very close working partnership among the three staffs attained at this conference will result in shortening the war. Meetings of the three staffs will be continued in the future whenever the need arises.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nazi Germany is doomed. The German people will only make the cost of their defeat heavier to themselves by attempting to continue a hopeless resistance.

**2. Occupation and control of Germany**

We have agreed on common policies and plans for enforcing the unconditional surrender terms which we shall impose together on Nazi Germany after German armed resistance has been finally crushed. These terms will not be made known until the final defeat of Germany is accomplished.

Under the agreed plan, the forces of the three Powers will each occupy a separate zone of Germany. Co-ordinated administration and control has been provided for under the plan through a Central Control Commission consisting of the supreme commanders of the three Powers with headquarters in Berlin.

It has been agreed that France should be invited by the three Powers if she should so desire, to take a zone of occupation, and to participate as fourth member of the Control Commission. The limits of the French zone will be agreed by the four governments concerned through their representatives on the European Advisory Commission.

It is our inflexible purpose to destroy German militarism and Nazism, and to ensure that Germany will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world.

We are determined to :—

Disarm and disband all German armed forces;

Break up for all time the German General Staff that has repeatedly contrived the resurgence of German militarism;

Remove or destroy all German military equipment;

Eliminate or control all German industry that could be used for military production;

Bring all war criminals to justice and swift punishment and exact reparation in kind for the destruction wrought by Germans;

Wipe out the Nazi Party, Nazi laws, organisations and institutions;

Remove all Nazi and militarist influences from public offices and from the cultural and economic life of the German people;

And take in harmony such other measures in Germany as may be necessary to future peace and safety of the world.

It is not our purpose to destroy the people of Germany, but only when Nazism and militarism have been extirpated will there be hope for a decent life for Germans and a place for them in the comity of nations.

**3. Reparation by Germany**

We have considered the question of the damage caused by Germany to Allied nations in this war, and recognise it as just that Germany be obliged to make compensation for the damage in kind to the greatest extent possible. A commission for the compensation of damage will be established. The commission will be instructed to consider the question of the extent and methods for compensating damage caused by Germany to the Allied countries. The commission will work in Moscow.

**4. United Nations' Conference**

We are resolved upon the earliest possible establishment with our Allies of a general international organisation to maintain peace and security. We believe that this is essential both to prevent aggression and to remove the political, economic and social causes of war through the close and continuing collaboration of all peace-loving peoples. The foundations were laid at Dumbarton Oaks.

On the important question of voting procedure, however, agreement was not there reached. The present Conference has been able to resolve this difficulty.

We have agreed that a conference of United Nations should be called to meet at San Francisco in U.S.A. on April 25, 1945, to prepare the charter of such an organisation along lines proposed in the informal conversations at Dumbarton Oaks. The government of China and Provisional Government of France will be immediately consulted and invited to sponsor invitations to the conference jointly with the Governments of U.S.A., Gt. Britain and the U.S.S.R. As soon as the consultation with China and France has been completed the text of proposals on voting procedure will be made public.

**5. Declaration on Liberated Europe**

We have drawn up and subscribed to a declaration on Liberated Europe. This declaration provides for concerting the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policies of the three Powers, and for joint action by them in meeting the political and economic problems of Liberated Europe in accordance with democratic principles. The text of the declaration is as follows:—

The Premier of the U.S.S.R., the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and the President of the United States of America have consulted with each other in the common interests of the peoples of their countries and those of Liberated Europe. They jointly declare their mutual agreement to concert during the temporary period of instability in Liberated Europe the policies of their three Governments in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany, and the people of the former Axis satellite States of Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems.

The establishment of order in Europe and the rebuilding of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism, and to create democratic institutions of their own choice.

This is a principle of the Atlantic Charter—the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live—the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those peoples who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations.

To foster the conditions in which the liberated peoples may exercise these rights, the three Governments will jointly assist the people in any European Liberated State or former Axis satellite State in Europe where, in their judgment, conditions require:—

(*a*) To establish conditions of internal peace; (*b*) To carry out emergency measures for the relief of distressed people; (*c*) To form interim Governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of Governments responsive to the will of the people; and (*d*) To facilitate where necessary the holding of such elections.

The three Governments will consult the other United Nations and provisional authorities or other Governments in Europe when matters of direct interest to them are under consideration.

When, in the opinion of the three Governments, conditions in any European liberated State or any former Axis satellite State in Europe make such action necessary, they will immediately consult together on the measures necessary to discharge the joint responsibilities set forth in this Declaration.

By this Declaration, we reaffirm our faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, our pledge in the Declaration by the United Nations, and our determination to build in co-operation with other peace-loving nations a world order under law, dedicated to peace, security, freedom and the general well-being of all mankind.

In issuing this Declaration, the three Powers express the hope that the Provisional Government of the French Republic may be associated with themselves in the procedure suggested.

**6. Poland**

We came to the Crimea Conference resolved to settle our differences about Poland. We discussed fully all aspects of the question. We reaffirmed our common desire to see established a strong, free, independent and democratic Poland. As a result of our discussion, we have agreed on the conditions in which a new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity may be formed in such a manner as to command recognition by the three major Powers. The agreement reached is as follows:—

A new situation has been created in Poland as a result of her complete liberation by the Red Army.

This calls for the establishment of a Polish Provisional Government which can be more broadly based than was possible before the recent liberation of Western Poland. The Provisional Government which is now functioning in Poland should, therefore, be reorganised on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself, and from Poles abroad. This new Government should then be called the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity.

V. M. Molotov, Mr. Harriman and Sir A. Clark Kerr are authorised as a Commission to consult in first instance in Moscow with members of the present Provisional

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government and with other Polish democratic leaders from within Poland and from abroad, with a view to reorganisation of the present Government along the above lines.

This Polish Provisional Government of National Unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates.

When a Polish Provisional Government of National Unity has been properly formed in conformity with the above, the Government of the U.S.S.R., which now maintains diplomatic relations with the present Provisional Government of Poland, and the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the U.S.A. will establish diplomatic relations with the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity, and will exchange ambassadors by whose reports the respective Governments will be kept informed about the situation in Poland.

The three heads of Government consider that the eastern frontier of Poland should follow the Curzon Line with digressions from it in some regions of five to eight kilometres (3⅛ to 5 miles) in favour of Poland. They recognise that Poland must receive substantial accessions of territory in the north and west. They feel that the opinion of the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity should be sought in due course on the extent of these accessions, and that the final delimitations of the western frontier of Poland should thereafter await the Peace Conference.

**7. Yugoslavia**

We have agreed to recommend to Marshal Tito and Dr. Subasic that the agreement between them should be put into effect immediately, and that a joint provisional Government should be formed on the basis of that agreement:

We also recommend that as soon as the new Government has been formed it should declare that:—

1. The anti-Fascist Assembly of National Liberation (*Avnoj*) should be extended to include members of the last Yugoslav Parliament (*Skupschtina*) who have not compromised themselves by collaboration with the enemy, thus forming a body to be known as a temporary Parliament, and

2. Legislative Acts passed by the anti-fascist Assembly of National Liberation will be subject to subsequent ratification by a Constituent Assembly.

There was also a general review of other Balkan questions.

**8. Meetings of Foreign Secretaries**

Throughout the conference, besides the daily meetings of the heads of Governments and Foreign Secretaries, separate meetings of the three Foreign Secretaries and their advisers have also been held daily.

These meetings have proved of the utmost value, and the conference agreed that permanent machinery should be set up for regular consultation between the three Foreign Secretaries. They will, therefore, meet as often as may be necessary, probably about every three or four months. These meetings will be held in rotation in the three capitals, the first meeting being held in London after the United Nations Conference on World Security Organisation.

**9. Unity for peace as for war**

Our meeting here in the Crimea has reaffirmed our common determination to maintain and strengthen in the peace to come that unity of purpose and of action which has made victory possible and certain for the United Nations in this war. We believe that this is a sacred obligation which our Governments owe to our peoples and to all the peoples of the world.

Only with continuing and growing co-operation and understanding among our three countries and among all the peace-loving nations can the highest aspiration of humanity be realised—a secure and lasting peace which will, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, " afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

It is considered that victory in this war and the establishment of the proposed International Organisation will provide the greatest opportunity in all history to create in the years to come the essential conditions of such a peace.

Signed:—
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
J. V. STALIN.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Book Reviews

## Shot and Shell—without Strategy

*Why Not Trust the Tories?* by Celticus (Aneurin Bevan, M.P.).

*Brendan and Beverley* by Cassius (Gollancz Ltd., 2*s*6*d* each).

EACH ADDITION to the now famous series of yellow-cover anti-Tory booklets which have filled the bookstalls builds up the powerful indictment of the pre-war record of Tory reaction and draws warnings for the future. In many respects brilliantly written, they provide ammunition for an impending electoral contest. This does not mean, however, that they are in all respects an adequate political guide. Ammunition alone cannot win a victory without strategy. In this respect they are less effective.

The attempt to attribute all the evils of the two decades between the wars to the wickedness and deceptions of Tory reaction, may be good electioneering, but is poor political analysis. Such exposure is necessary, but does not yet teach the essential lesson. The far greater criminalities and deceptions of Hitlerism and Nazism similarly need exposure, but are not the explanation of its success in winning power in Germany or terrorising Europe. The real question is: If the Left was continuously defeated in Britain, and in Western Europe generally, during the two decades between the wars, did it deserve to win? Were there not faults of disunity, confusions of policy, heresy-hunting, acquiescence in Tory policy at critical points, failure to rise to the responsibility of leadership and seriously strive to rally the majority of the people? And are not these weaknesses the most important lesson for the future, which we must overcome in order to win.

Mr. Bevan finds that "the resemblance between the political situation today and that at the end of the last war is extraordinary." It is impossible to accept this. The differences are enormously greater than the resemblance; and it is these differences, in the character of the war, its outcome, in international relations, in the relations of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union, in the stage of the labour movement, in socialist-communist co-operation, in the internal situation in each country, and the new forces that have arisen in the experience of the struggle against fascism, which give the ground of hope for the future, provided the lessons are learnt aright.

It is known that Mr. Bevan and some of the other writers in this series have on occasions expressed themselves in favour of the aim of unity of the labour movement and a broad coalition of progressive and democratic forces as the best means to defeat the manoeuvres of reaction. Would it not serve a useful purpose if a new yellow-paper booklet could appear and fill the bookstalls on this theme of *labour and progressive unity? The public* may tire of a diet of exposures only, and look for constructive leadership.

R.P.D.

## Shorter Notice

*Russia and the Peace* by Bernard Pares (Penguin, 201 pp., 9*d*).

THIS BOOK based on an extensive knowledge of Czarist Russia and an intensive ignorance of Marxism and the British working-class movement, will impair the reputation which this writer had begun to acquire in labour circles. It seems that the Trades Union Congress adopted the Bolshevik programme in autumn, 1925 (which it did not) and earlier that year the President of the Miners' Federation, who was visiting the U.S.S.R., had a talk with Lenin (then twelve months in his tomb). Errors such as these, despite the undoubted good intentions of the author, are blemishes on his learned advocacy of friendship with the Soviet Union.

---

**CORRECTION:** The following are the titles of Penguin Books reviewed or mentioned in our February issue:—Politics made Plain by T. L. Horabin; Our Settlement with Germany by H. N. Brailsford.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GUARANTEE FUND (*Continued from page ii. of cover*)

# LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

## Amount received in February, 1945 : £94 : 17 : 6

| | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| R. N. Millar | | 10 | 0 |
| S. Oyston | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| J. Pack | | 2 | 6 |
| R. Radcliffe | | 3 | 6 |
| B. Twombly | | 14 | 10 |
| W. Breach | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| T. W. R. | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| B. Yates | | 3 | 0 |
| S. Morrissy | | 12 | 0 |
| Mrs. Legler | | 2 | 6 |
| Office Worker | | 4 | 6 |
| J. S. Hunter | | 3 | 0 |
| Mrs. Myers | | 2 | 0 |
| N. E. Bell | | 13 | 0 |
| E. G. B. | | | 10 |
| Mr.& Mrs.Humphries | | 2 | 6 |
| Learner | | 3 | 0 |
| J. Gordon | | 2 | 0 |
| Russophile | | 5 | 0 |
| E. C. Talbot | | 3 | 6 |
| B. Stevens | | 2 | 6 |
| S. Jones | | 3 | 6 |
| A. Barcan | | 5 | 0 |
| D. Tannert | | 13 | 0 |
| D. H. Strathern and Friends | | 10 | 0 |
| M. R. Turner | | 1 | 6 |
| H. Lowin | | 10 | 6 |
| FRAROS | | 6 | 6 |
| G. K. | | 7 | 6 |
| W. Burbridge | | 2 | 6 |
| Lower Morden D.G. | | 5 | 0 |
| J. Gray | | 10 | 0 |
| J. Purton | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| H. White | | 2 | 0 |
| P. Bielschowsky | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| L. Reason | | 3 | 0 |
| G. G. Thomas | | 13 | 0 |
| Leftenant Canuck | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| G. J. Orwin | | 2 | 6 |
| C. Bloomfield | | 3 | 0 |
| E. Stout | | 5 | 0 |
| W. Maddison | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| E. Reckitt | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| R. Leadbetter | | 13 | 0 |
| W. M. Davies | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| E. McCallum | | 5 | 0 |
| E. Widdowson | | 4 | 6 |
| H. Percival | | 3 | 6 |
| K. Spathaky | | 2 | 0 |
| B. Goldbloom | | 14 | 0 |
| V. Shelley | | 3 | 0 |
| W. Wallace | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| L. A. Watts | | 3 | 6 |
| C. Wood | | 7 | 0 |
| B. W. F. | | 12 | 7 |
| A. Collindridge | | 3 | 0 |
| R. Bushby | | 13 | 0 |
| Salud | | 5 | 0 |
| J. Mooney | | 3 | 0 |
| Socialist Soldier | | 10 | 0 |
| E. Connington | | 1 | 6 |
| J. W. | | | 6 |
| G. Cox | | 10 | 0 |
| F. Renouf | | 5 | 6 |
| M. Dewsnap | | 2 | 0 |
| M. S. Rix | | 5 | 6 |
| J. E. Brown | | 13 | 0 |
| P. de Paris | | 3 | 0 |
| Mrs. Stubbs | | 3 | 0 |
| L. Youatt | | 14 | 0 |
| C. Nixon | | 3 | 0 |
| B. Smith | | | 6 |
| R. Green | | 3 | 0 |
| S. Datta | | 3 | 0 |
| E. W. Watson | | 3 | 0 |
| P. Andrews and Friend | 1 | 10 | 0 |
| P. Inwald | | 7 | 0 |
| J. M. S. Roberts | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Edinburgh D.G. | | 5 | 6 |
| W. Jackson | | 1 | 0 |
| Old Age Pensioner | | 2 | 6 |
| B. Lawson | | 13 | 0 |
| E. M. Thomas | | 6 | 0 |
| Colwyn Bay D.G. | | 2 | 6 |
| G. Robson | | 5 | 0 |
| F. Barker | | 3 | 0 |
| D. Hengoed | | 3 | 0 |
| T. Castley | | 13 | 0 |
| N. Macdonald | | 13 | 0 |
| T. V. Hall | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| B. Grundy | | 13 | 0 |
| L.A.C. Dawson | | 3 | 0 |
| R. G. U., R.A.C. | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| A. E. Morris | | 13 | 0 |
| Transport Command | | 10 | 0 |
| S. Mill | | 10 | 0 |
| W. Lakin-Smith | | 2 | 6 |
| A. L. Jones | | 1 | 0 |
| L. V. Wells | | 5 | 0 |
| C. Nixon | | 5 | 0 |
| R. W. Nother | | 2 | 6 |
| W. Potter | | 3 | 0 |
| G. Morey | | 5 | 0 |
| Druzya Uchitiellya | | 12 | 0 |
| D. Rees | | 10 | 0 |
| Eric and Norah | | 10 | 0 |
| F. Sawyer | | 13 | 0 |
| F. E. Stehr | | 5 | 0 |
| H. S. Lee | | 14 | 8 |
| H. Morton | | 8 | 0 |
| D. Parvin | | 9 | 0 |
| A. W. Ford | | 15 | 0 |
| E. G. Waller | | 13 | 0 |
| J. Ellis | | 5 | 0 |
| Penrith D.G. | | 6 | 0 |
| S. Clegg | | 10 | 0 |
| 1st £25 Group | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| D. K. Pitt | | 2 | 6 |
| J. Macdonald | | 5 | 0 |
| R. Serjeant | | 10 | 0 |
| Learner | | 2 | 0 |
| R. Chambers | | 13 | 0 |
| E. Belsey | | 2 | 6 |
| T. H. Fletcher | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| I. Price | | 2 | 0 |
| D. Harries | | 1 | 6 |
| C. Walder | | | 6 |
| Office Worker | | 5 | 0 |
| J. Marlin | | 3 | 0 |
| A. Bruce | | 5 | 0 |
| E. Fischer | | 1 | 0 |
| Anon | | 15 | 0 |
| H. McGeachan | | 3 | 0 |
| E. Ashworth | | 5 | 0 |
| E. J. Thomas | | 2 | 6 |
| H. S. M. | | 2 | 6 |
| J. Pack | | 2 | 6 |
| K. B. Kay | | 2 | 6 |
| G. Miller | | 2 | 6 |
| V.A.D. | | 5 | 0 |
| J. Craig | | 3 | 0 |
| J. B. Simpson | | 8 | 4 |
| R. Innes | | 3 | 0 |
| J. Lust | | 2 | 0 |
| H. Williams | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Director | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| T. Z. | | 8 | 0 |
| D. Oakeshott | | 5 | 0 |
| M. Jordan | | 3 | 0 |
| L. Drewitt | | 13 | 0 |
| P. Dodsworth | | 3 | 0 |
| The Bacon Family | | 5 | 0 |
| W. H. Allen | | 13 | 0 |
| C. Parr | | 1 | 0 |
| J. Stewart | | 1 | 0 |
| E. McCallum | | 5 | 0 |
| R. Hart | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| H. A. B. | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Mrs. Maugham | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Anon, Whitchurch | | 1 | 0 |
| Radio Mech.,R.E.M.E. | | 10 | 0 |
| E. S., C.M.F. | | 15 | 9 |
| T. Williams | | 2 | 6 |
| N. Megirian | | 7 | 0 |
| T. Craig | | 1 | 0 |
| E. Halton | | 3 | 0 |
| B. Stevens | | 2 | 6 |
| M. P. | | 3 | 0 |
| N. Fairman | | 5 | 6 |
| V. Pearson | | 2 | 6 |
| Mr.& Mrs.Humphries | | 2 | 6 |
| G. E. and M. Philibert | | 10 | 0 |
| Anon | | 10 | 6 |
| I. Bywaters | | 5 | 0 |
| V. Smith | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| F. M. R. | | 10 | 0 |
| M. W. Eve | | 13 | 0 |
| A. W. Bertram | | 7 | 0 |
| J. E. Brown | | 10 | 0 |
| Russophile | | 10 | 0 |
| J. Miller | | 1 | 6 |
| S. Frishberg | | 7 | 0 |
| N. Kelly | | 6 | 6 |
| C. Dickens | | | 6 |
| J. R. McCormack | | 1 | 6 |
| A. R. Trim | | 3 | 0 |
| H. Bernstein | | 2 | 0 |
| J. Gibson | | 5 | 0 |
| K. Harrison | | 3 | 0 |
| F. Fenton | | 1 | 6 |
| L'Humanite | | 2 | 0 |
| A. Downing | | | 6 |
| R. F. B. | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| J. Dunlop | | 13 | 0 |
| S. Morrissy | | 18 | 0 |
| J. Dunsby | | 10 | 0 |
| N. Parsons | | 3 | 0 |
| F. J. Brand | | 1 | 6 |
| Socialist Sailor | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| R. R. R. | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| G. Kemp | | 7 | 0 |
| Eight of the Boys | | 10 | 0 |
| D. Knight | | 2 | 0 |
| S. S. | | 2 | 6 |
| Socialist Signalman | | 10 | 0 |

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The Struggle for French Democracy

Cyril Claydon

The author shows the great contribution France has made to the struggle for democracy in Europe and how the courageous fight of the Resistance Movement will again place her among the great nations of Europe.

*Coming* 5/- *Shortly*

*Lawrence & Wishart Ltd., 2 Southampton Place, W.C.1*

**STILL AVAILABLE**

**A new pamphlet**

# WAR CRIMINALS

**by**

**D. N. PRITT, K.C., M.P.**

**Price one shilling.**

**(POST FREE 1/1)**

***Obtainable everywhere, or direct from the Publishers—***

**LABOUR MONTHLY, 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3**


*Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED